arXiv:1404.1646v1 [cs.CG] 7 Apr 2014

Proximal Navigation Graphs and t-spanners

Guillermo Ruiz* [1] and Edgar Chávez† [2]

[1]Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, México
[2]Centro de Investigación Científica y de Educación Superior de Ensenada

April 8, 2014

Abstract

Let $(X, \mathbf{d})$ be a metric space, $V \subseteq X$ a finite set, and $E \subseteq V \times V$. We call the graph $G(E, V)$ a *metric* graph if each edge $(u, v) \in E$ has weight $d(u, v)$. In particular edge (u, u) is in the graph and have distance 0. We call G a *proximal navigation graph* or PN-graph if for each edge $(u, v) \in E$ either $u = v$ or there is a node u_1 such that $(u, u_1) \in E$ and $\mathbf{d}(u, v) > \mathbf{d}(u_1, v)$. In such graph it is possible to navigate greedily from an arbitrary source node to an arbitrary target node by reducing the distance between the current node and the target node in each step. The complete graph, the Delaunay triangulation and the Half Space Proximal (HSP) graph (defined below in the paper) are examples of PN-graphs.

In this paper we study the relationship between PN-graphs and t-spanners and prove that there are PN-graphs that are not t-spanners for any t. On the positive side we give sufficient conditions for a PN-graph to be a t-spanner and prove that any PN-graph over $\mathbb{R}^n$ under the euclidean distance is a t-spanner.

1 Introduction

We start with some definitions to establish the problem we want to study. Let $(X, \mathbf{d})$ be a metric space, $V \subseteq X$ a finite set, and $E \subseteq V \times V$. The graph $G(E, V)$ is a *metric* graph if each edge $(u, v) \in E$ has weight $\mathbf{d}(u, v)$. In particular edge (u, u) is in the graph and have distance 0. Define G a *proximal navigation graph* or PN-graph if for each edge $(u, v) \in E$ either $u = v$ or there is a node u_1 such that $(u, u_1) \in E$ and $\mathbf{d}(u, v) > \mathbf{d}(u_1, v)$. This means there is always a path connecting arbitrary nodes u, v such that the distance to the target node v and successive nodes in the path decrease monotonically. A graph $G(E, V)$ is said to be *strongly connected* if there is a path from u to v for any $u, v \in V$. A graph G is a t-spanner if for every pair of points u and v in G, we have $\mathbf{d}_G(u, v) \leq t\mathbf{d}(u, v)$ where $\mathbf{d}_G(u, v)$ is the length of the smallest path between u and v. The parameter t is called the stretch factor of G.

We say that a family of strongly connected graphs is a *t-spanner* if every graph G in the family is a t-spanner. Note that each graph on the family has the same t as stretch factor.

In a PN-graph G, the *proximity path* from u to v, $\mathbf{PP}(u, v)$, is constructed as follows: We start in u and continue with the neighbor of u closer to v and repeat until we reach v. Note that $\mathbf{PP}(u, v)$ is contained in the ball center at v with radius $\mathbf{d}(u, v)$, $B_{\mathbf{d}(u,v)}(v)$.

The complete graph is trivially both a 1-spanner and a PN-graph. Another more interesting example is the *Delaunay triangulation* (DT), defined for a set V of points in the plane, as the triangulation such that no point in V is inside the circumcircle of a triangle in DT. It is well known that DT is a $\frac{4\pi}{3\sqrt{3}}$-spanner. It is also known that DT is a PN-graph, see for example [1].

*gruiz@dep.fie.umich.mx
†elchavez@cicese.mx

Another example of a PN-graph is the Half Space Proximal (HSP)[2]. To obtain the HSP of a finite point set V each $u \in V$ computes their HSP neighbors $HSP(u)$ in a distributed manner. The *allowed region* is initially all the points V, let $A = V$ be that set. The nearest neighbor of u in A is computed, and $NN(u)$ is added to $HSP(u)$. All points in A closer to $NN(u)$ than to u are removed from A, this removed set is called the *forbidden region* and the process is repeated until A, the allowed region is empty. Below we prove that the HSP is a PN-graph.

Lemma 1. *If there is not an edge from the point u to v then there exist a point z such that it connects to u and z is in the intersection of the two circles centred at u and v with radius $\mathbf{d}(u, v)$.*

Proof. If there is not an edge from the point u to v, then, v is in a forbidden region of u and some point z. The point z connects to u and is closer to u than from v, so, z is in the circle centered at u with radius $\mathbf{d}(u, v)$. As v is in the forbidden region of u with respect to z, then v is closer to z than to u, so, z is in the circle centered at v with radius $\mathbf{d}(u, v)$. □

Lemma 2. *The HSP is a proximal navigation graph.*

Proof. From lemma 1, if (u, v) is not an edge in the HSP, then there exist a point z connected to u, with z in the interior of the intersection of the two circles centered at u and v respectively, and with radius $\mathbf{d}(u, v)$. This implies, $\mathbf{d}(z, v) < \mathbf{d}(u, v)$. The argument can be repeated on the pair z and v until we reach v to get a path from u to v as the path in the definition of a PN-graph. □

2 Are Proximal Navigation Graphs t-Spanners?

The motivation in investigating if PN-graphs are t-spanners, comes from a statement in [2]. Authors claimed the HSP is a t-spanner, but the proof had a gap as noticed in [3]. It is very difficult to prove directly if the HSP is a t-spanner, a more general question could be easier to prove, as stated below.

Conjecture 1. *Every family of proximity navigation graphs is a t-spanner.*

Assume conjecture 1 is false, then there exist a family of proximity navigation graphs such that for all $t > 0$ there is a graph H in the family and two points u and v in H such that $\mathbf{d}_H(u, v) > t\mathbf{d}(u, v)$.

Note that the length of every path from u to v is also greater than $t\mathbf{d}(u, v)$. Let P be the proximity path between u and v, $P = \mathbf{PP}(u, v)$, the *length inside the ball* $\mathbf{B}_r(x)$ in P will be the length of the path P from the farthest point from v in $\mathbf{B}_r(x) \cap P$ to the closest point from v in $\mathbf{B}_r(x) \cap P$.

For the rest of this section we will assume that Conjecture 1 is false.

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a family of proximity navigation graphs that is not a t-spanners. For all $M > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exist a proximity navigation graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and a point x in G such that the length inside the ball $\mathbf{B}_\epsilon(x)$ in P is greater than M. We will say that $\mathcal{G}$ has an* unbounded approximation point*.*

Proof. Suppose this lemma is false, then there exist an $M > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all proximity navigation graphs $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and all x in G, the length inside the ball $\mathbf{B}_\epsilon(x)$ of $P = \mathbf{PP}(u, v)$ is smaller than M.

The length inside $\mathbf{B}_\epsilon(u)$ of P is less than M. Let y_1 be the last point from P in that ball, following P, y_1 is connected to x_2, the length inside the ball $\mathbf{B}_\epsilon(x_2)$ of P less than M. Let y_2 be the last point from P in that last ball, following P, y_2 is connected to x_3. We continue in this way.

Note that when we go from x_i to x_{i+1} we get closer to v at least ϵ, hence the number of points in the sequence $x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_i, \cdots$ is bounded, say by K. Let H, u, and v be as in the negation of Conjecture 1 for $t = l + 2K$ with $l\mathbf{d}(u, v) > KM$.

Then, the length of P is less or equal than $K(M + 2\mathbf{d}(u, v))$, then:

$$\mathbf{d}_H(u, v) \leq \texttt{length of } P \leq KM + 2K\mathbf{d}(u, v).$$

But

$$\mathbf{d}_H(u, v) \geq t\mathbf{d}(u, v) = (l + 2K)\mathbf{d}(u, v) = l\mathbf{d}(u, v) + 2K\mathbf{d}(u, v)$$

$$> KM + 2K\mathbf{d}(u, v)$$

which is a contradiction.

□

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a family of proximal navigation graphs. If $\mathcal{G}$ is not a t-spanner, then $\mathcal{G}$ has an unbounded approximation point. If $\mathcal{G}$ does not have an unbounded approximation point, then $\mathcal{G}$ is a t-spanner.*

Proof. The first implication is the last lemma. For the last implication let us suppose that $\mathcal{G}$ is not a t-spanner, then for the first implication we have that $\mathcal{G}$ should have an unbounded approximation point which is a contradiction. □

An application of the theorem is that a family of PN-graphs in the metric space of bitmaps of length m using the hamming distance is a t-spanner: if we have a family in this metric space, then for every two bitmaps u and v, we have $\mathbf{d}(u, v) \leq m$ and each time we move from u to v the distance decreases at least by 1, then we reach v in at most m points. Then this family cannot have an unbounded approximation point. This lead to the following

Remark 1. *If the distance function $\mathbf{d}$ only takes integer values, then every family of PN-graphs in a metric space $(X, \mathbf{d})$ is a t-spanner.*

A more interesting result is with graphs with rational coordinates.

Lemma 4. *In $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the euclidean distance $\mathbf{d}_E$, every family of PN graphs where all points have rational coordinates is a t-spanner.*

Proof. Since for every graph $G = (E, V)$ in the family, all points have rational coordinates, we can take the least common multiple m of all the denominators. If we multiply m for each point in V, we will have a set of points V' with integer coordinates. Then there is a graph $G' = (E', V')$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is isomorphic to G where all the points in V' have integer coordinates, and $\mathbf{d}_E(u, v) = m\mathbf{d}_E(u', v')$ where u' and v' are the image of u and v over the isomorphism.

The family of graphs is a t-spanner if and only if the family of isomorphic graphs is a t-spanner. Since the family of isomorphic graphs does not contain an unbounded approximation point, each family is a t-spanner. □

Theorem 2.2. *In $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the euclidean distance $\mathbf{d}_E$, every family of PN graphs is a t-spanner.*

Proof. Since every point in $\mathbb{R}^n$ has a point with rational coordinates at distance at most ϵ for every $\epsilon > 0$, for each graph $G = (E, V)$ in the family, we can build an isomorphic graph $G' = (E', V')$ where the distance between any point u and its isomorphic point u' is at distance at most ϵ. We have

$$|\mathbf{d}_E(u, v) - \mathbf{d}_E(u', v')| < 2\epsilon$$

this means

$$\mathbf{d}_E(u', v') < 2\epsilon + \mathbf{d}_E(u, v)$$

also

$$|\mathbf{d}_G(u, v) - \mathbf{d}_{G'}(u', v')| < 2N\epsilon$$

where N is the number of points in the path from u to v. So, we have

$$\mathbf{d}_G(u, v) < 2N\epsilon + \mathbf{d}_{G'}(u', v').$$

By Lemma 4, G' is a t'-spanner, so,

$$\mathbf{d}_{G'}(u', v') < t'\mathbf{d}_E(u', v').$$

Let ϵ be such that $2N\epsilon < \mathbf{d}_E(u,v)$ and $2t'\epsilon < \mathbf{d}_E(u,v)$. Now we have

$$\mathbf{d}_{G'}(u',v') < t'(2\epsilon + \mathbf{d}_E(u,v)) < 2t'\epsilon + t'\mathbf{d}_E(u,v) < \mathbf{d}_E(u,v) + t'\mathbf{d}_E(u,v)$$

so,

$$\mathbf{d}_{G'}(u',v') < (t'+1)\mathbf{d}_E(u,v).$$

Finally

$$\mathbf{d}_G(u,v) < 2N\epsilon + (t'+1)\mathbf{d}_E(u,v) < \mathbf{d}_E(u,v) + (t'+1)\mathbf{d}_E(u,v)$$
$$\mathbf{d}_G(u,v) < (t'+2)\mathbf{d}_E(u,v).$$

□

3 A Family of Proximal Navigation Graphs that it is not a t-spanner

For $\epsilon > 0$ let X be the following set of functions from [0,1] to [0,1]

$$f_0(x) = 0$$

$$f_1(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq 1/2 - \epsilon \\ 1 & \text{if } 1/2 - \epsilon < x \leq 1/2 \\ 1/2 & \text{if } x > 1/2 \end{cases}$$

$$f_2(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq 1/2 - 2\epsilon \\ 1 & \text{if } 1/2 - 2\epsilon < x \leq 1/2 \\ 1/3 & \text{if } x > 2/3 \\ f_1(x) & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}$$

$$f_3(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq 1/2 - 3\epsilon \\ 1 & \text{if } 1/2 - 3\epsilon < x \leq 1/2 \\ 1/4 & \text{if } x > 3/4 \\ f_2(x) & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$f_i(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq 1/2 - i\epsilon \\ 1 & \text{if } 1/2 - i\epsilon < x \leq 1/2 \\ 1/(i+1) & \text{if } x > i/(i+1) \\ f_{i-1}(x) & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$f_\infty(x) = 1$$

Let $\mathbf{d}_X \colon X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\mathbf{d}_X(f,g) = \mu(\{x \in [0,1] | f(x) \neq g(x)\})$ where μ is the Lebesgue measure. Table 1 show some example distances between some of the functions.

We will see that the function $\mathbf{d}_X$ is a distance over the set X. The complicated part is the triangle inequality. We want to prove that $\mathbf{d}_X(f_x,f_y) + \mathbf{d}_X(f_y,f_z) \geq \mathbf{d}_X(f_x,f_z)$. Is easy to prove it if two of the tree functions are equal or if $z = \infty$. Without lose of generality, $x < z$, and we have tree cases.

	f_0	f_1	f_2	f_3	$\cdots$	f_∞
f_0	0	$1/2+\epsilon$	$1/2+2\epsilon$	$1/2+3\epsilon$		1
f_1	$1/2+\epsilon$	0	$1/3+\epsilon$	$1/3+2\epsilon$		$1-\epsilon$
f_2	$1/2+2\epsilon$	$1/3+\epsilon$	0	$1/4+\epsilon$		$1-2\epsilon$
f_3	$1/2+3\epsilon$	$1/3+2\epsilon$	$1/4+\epsilon$	0		$1-3\epsilon$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$		$\vdots$
f_∞	1	$1-\epsilon$	$1-2\epsilon$	$1-3\epsilon$		0

Table 1: Distances between functions

Case $y < x$ We have

$$\mathbf{d}_X(f_x, f_z) = \frac{1}{x+2} + (z-x)\epsilon$$

but, since $z-y > z-x$ then $z-x < z-y+x-y$. Also we have $\frac{1}{x+2} < \frac{1}{y+2} < \frac{2}{y+2}$.

$$\frac{1}{x+2} + (z-x)\epsilon < \frac{2}{y+2} + (z-y+x-y)\epsilon$$

$$= \frac{1}{y+2} + (x-y)\epsilon + \frac{1}{y+2}(z-y)\epsilon = \mathbf{d}_X(f_x, f_y) + \mathbf{d}_X(f_y, f_z)$$

Case $x < y < z$ Here we have $\frac{1}{y+2} < \frac{1}{x+2}$ and

$$\mathbf{d}_X(f_x, f_y) + \mathbf{d}_X(f_y, f_z) = \frac{1}{x+2} + (y-x)\epsilon + \frac{1}{y+2}(z-y)\epsilon$$

$$> \frac{1}{x+2} + (y-x)\epsilon + \frac{1}{x+2}(z-y)\epsilon = \frac{2}{x+2}(z-x)\epsilon > \frac{1}{x+2}(z-x)\epsilon = \mathbf{d}_X(f_x, f_z)$$

Case $z < y$ In this case $z-x < y-x$ and

$$\mathbf{d}_X(f_x, f_z) = \frac{1}{x+2} + (z-x)\epsilon < \frac{1}{x+2} + (y-x)\epsilon$$

$$< \frac{1}{x+2} + (y-x)\epsilon + \frac{1}{z+2} + (y-z)\epsilon = \mathbf{d}_X(f_x, f_y) + \mathbf{d}_X(f_y, f_z).$$

We have shown that $\mathbf{d}_X$ is a distance function.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of graphs $(E_1, V_1), (E_2, V_2), \ldots, (E_k, V_k), \ldots$ where

$$E_i = \{\{f_0, f_1\}, \{f_1, f_2\}, \ldots, \{f_k, f_{k+1}\}, \ldots, \{f_i, f_\infty\}\},$$

$$V_i = \{f_\infty, f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_i\}.$$

We will show that every graph in the family $\mathcal{F}$ is a proximity navigation graph for a suitable ϵ. We need to show that for every pair of points in the graph, u and v, there is a path from u to v that is getting closer to v. From the table of distances the result is clear if one of the points is f_0 or $f\infty$. If one point is f_i the result is also clear if we see the distances from f_i to the other points:

$$\frac{1}{2}+i\epsilon, \frac{1}{3}+(i-1)\epsilon, \frac{1}{4}+(i-2)\epsilon, \ldots, \frac{1}{i+1}+\epsilon, 0, \frac{1}{i+2}+\epsilon, \frac{1}{i+2}+2\epsilon, \frac{1}{i+2}+3\epsilon, \ldots, 1-i\epsilon$$

in this list, we have the distances from f_i to $f_0, f_1, \ldots, f\infty$.

The family $\mathcal{F}$ is not a t-spanner because for every $t > 0$ we can find a graph G in $\mathcal{F}$ such that the $\mathbf{d}_G(f_0, f\infty) > t\mathbf{d}_X(f_0, f\infty)$=t. That is because the distance in the graph G from f_0 to f_∞ is

$$\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon+\frac{1}{3}+\epsilon+\frac{1}{4}+\epsilon+\cdots$$

which is a non convergent series. The Conjecture 1 is false.

Remark 2. *If we apply the HSP to this family, we get the same graphs, hence the HSP is not always a t-spanner.*

4 Conclusions

We proved that a PN-graph is a t-spanner when the points are in $\mathbb{R}^n$ using the euclidean distance. We showed that not all families of proximity navigation graphs are t-spanners. In particular we proved that the HSP is not always a t-spanner and although we proved that the HSP is a t-spanner in $\mathbb{R}^n$ using the euclidean distance, we do not know what the value of t is.

References

[1] Bose, P., Morin, P.: Online routing in triangulations. SIAM journal on computing **33**(4) (2004) 937–951

[2] Chávez, E., Dobrev, S., Kranakis, E., Opatrny, J., Stacho, L., Tejeda, H., Urrutia, J.: Half-space proximal: A new local test for extracting a bounded dilation spanner of a unit disk graph. In Anderson, J.H., Prencipe, G., Wattenhofer, R., eds.: OPODIS. Volume 3974 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science., Springer (2005) 235–245

[3] Bose, P., Carmi, P., Couture, M., Smid, M., Xu, D.: On a family of strong geometric spanners that admit local routing strategies. In: Algorithms and Data Structures. Springer (2007) 300–311